

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 227

PS 006 403

AUTHOR Allen, Sally V.
TITLE Early Childhood Planning in the States: A Handbook for Gathering Data and Assessing Needs.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO OCD-CB-167
PUB DATE Jan 73
NOTE 51p.; The fourth report of the Education Commission of the States Early Childhood Task Force
AVAILABLE FROM Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln St., Denver, Colorado 80203 (\$1.00, Report No. 32)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Child Development; *Data Collection; Early Childhood; Guides; *Information Processing; *Preschool Programs; *Program Planning; Public Relations; *State Programs

ABSTRACT

Basic information that should be considered by a state when gathering data necessary to planning for child development programs, with emphasis on the five-year-old and under group, is provided. State assessment efforts are assumed to be comprised of at least four steps: (1) gathering the data, (2) assessing the data to determine needs, (3) utilizing the data and assessment for the development of a comprehensive state early childhood plan, and (4) informing the public about activities for broad interpretation and for support. The Planning Structure, Chapter II of this handbook, discusses why a needs assessment should be conducted, the planning responsibility, and steps that should be taken by the governor or legislature. Chapter III, The Data-Gathering Model, discusses basic needs that should be considered in order to increase the effectiveness of the data-gathering activities, basic information that is available through the 1970 census tapes, other data required (current child care and related services, manpower resources, administrative mechanisms, legal constraints, financial provisions, and other resources), local attitudes and demands, use of the computer, head count vs. sampling techniques, costs. The final chapter, IV, The Public Relations Effort, discusses the purpose of a state public information program in the early childhood field, the responsibility for development and implementation of the program, and information activities. An appendix provides the results of a Survey of State Needs Assessment Activities conducted in Fall 1972. A list of ECS Early Childhood Project publications is provided. (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 076227



PS 000003

task force members

Governor Calvin Rampton, Utah
Chairman

Milton Akers, Director
Florida Office of Early Childhood
Development

Robert W. Blanchard
Superintendent of Schools
Portland, Oregon

Mrs. Nikki Blankenship
Early Childhood Bilingual Program
Southwest Educational Development
Laboratory, Austin, Texas

Howard Bray
Academy for Contemporary Problems
Washington, D.C.

Preston Bruce, Director
Four-C Division
Office of Child Development, HEW

Benjamin Carmichael
Commissioner of Education, Tennessee

Mrs. Constance Cook
Member, New York State Assembly

Mrs. Barbara Fishberg, Executive Associate
Carnegie Corporation of New York

Mrs. March K. Fong
California State Representative

D. Robert Graham
Florida State Senator

Dr. Dorothy Gregg
Assistant to Director of Public Relations
U. S. Steel, New York City

Mrs. Beverly Gant
Vice President, Nursery School
Association for Childhood Education
International

John Hindrick, Director
Interagency Council for Child
Development Services

Orval Hansen, Maine
U. S. House of Representatives

Edwin Martin, Director
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
U. S. Office of Education, HEW

Robert E. McNair
Governor of South Carolina, 1965-71

Mrs. Ray E. Miller
Fargo, North Dakota Board of Education

John H. Niemeyer, President
Bank Street College, New York

Glen Nimnicht
Far West Laboratory for Educational
Research and Development
Berkeley, California

Rev. Albert Schneider, Superintendent
Archdiocese of Santa Fe, New Mexico

Howard Schrag, Director
Idaho Office of Child Development

John Sessions, Assistant Director
AFL-CIO Education Department
Washington, D.C.

Jule Sugarman, Administrator
Human Resources Administration
New York City

Daniel B. Taylor
Superintendent of Public Instruction
West Virginia

John V. Tunney, California
U. S. Senate

Mrs. Jeannette Watson, Director
Texas Office of Early Childhood
Development

Barnes White
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Official Observers

Mrs. Roger Jones, President
Parent Cooperative Preschools International

Mrs. Elizabeth Lewis
Santa Ana College, California

William Rapp, Vice President
Federation of Rocky Mountain States

Dwaine Ragan
Office of Child Development, HEW

Robert Wetherford
U. S. Office of Education, HEW

Education Commission of the States

Governor Winfield Dunn
Tennessee, ECS Chairman 1972-73

Wendell H. Pierce
Executive Director

James A. Madlett, Director
Elementary/Secondary Education Services

Mrs. Sally V. Allen
Project Director

ED 076227

**Early Childhood Planning
in the States:
A Handbook for Gathering
Data and Assessing Needs**

The fourth report of
The Education Commission of the States
Early Childhood Task Force

January 1973

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Education Commission
of the States

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE
OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION
BEYOND THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PER-
MISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

*Additional copies of this report may be obtained
for \$1.00 from the Education Commission of the
States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1800 Lincoln Street,
Denver, Colorado 80203.*

© 1973 Education Commission of the States

PS 006403

CONTENTS

I. Initiating Planning Efforts	3
II. The Planning Structure	6
III. The Data Gathering Model	16
IV. The Public Relations Effort	34
Appendix: Survey of State Assessment Activities	39
List of Project Publications	48

The ECS Early Childhood Project is funded jointly by the Office of Child Development and the Office of Education in the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Grant #OCD-CB-167).

The photograph on the cover was taken by Eric Morey, a graduate of the University of Colorado and the University of Chicago who is currently working as a free lance photographer in Denver.

1. INITIATING PLANNING EFFORTS

As pressures increase to initiate or expand services for the very young child and his family, states must make difficult decisions about public priorities and must insure that short- and long-range state plans are based upon adequate information. There is general agreement that competent planning and determination of priorities should be based upon a careful assessment of states' present and future needs for early childhood services. But there is little agreement about how best to define and assess those needs, what kinds of information are readily available and how an adequate assessment might be conducted for minimum cost. In fact, there is no general understanding about what the task of assessing needs really involves.

This report outlines the basic information which a state should consider as it gathers the data necessary to plan for child development programs. The report is not intended to provide simple answers to the complex questions involved in planning child care services. As much as possible, alternatives are indicated and their implications discussed. Obviously, state needs and objectives differ. Some states already have efforts which might simply be filled out and pulled together. At least two states (Idaho and Texas) are well along in statewide needs assessment programs. This report has benefited substantially from their experience.

Underlying the report is the assumption that--to have impact--a needs assessment must be conducted within a broad awareness of the political situation in the state. In other

words, no matter how carefully researched and meticulously conducted, a data-gathering effort will not affect public policy unless it is carefully and appropriately interpreted by the public, the legislature, the governor and the state and local agencies concerned with the young child. Throughout the report and more specifically in the concluding chapter, discussion of data-gathering techniques has been related to a broader framework of public information and political process.

The report assumes that state assessment efforts will be comprised of at least four steps: (1) gathering the data; (2) assessing this data to determine needs; (3) utilizing the data and assessment for the development of a comprehensive state early childhood plan; and (4) informing the public about activities for broad interpretation and for support for whatever program implementation might be consistent with the state's objectives. The steps are, of course, not necessarily sequential. Step four could and probably should begin at the same time as step one. In the report the terms are used somewhat interchangeably, because of their close relationship and interdependence.

The report is intended to serve as a handbook for those in the states concerned about analyzing the statewide need for new or additional services to young children and their families and for those interested in developing a data base from which to make decisions. It should give lawmakers and other decision makers a general picture of what might be involved in assessing early childhood needs. It should give state agency personnel preliminary guidelines for a data-gathering effort and finding the funding for it. By building upon the experience of those states which have already begun to analyze their needs, it should encourage further interstate information exchange in this very important aspect of implementing state early childhood

development programs.

This report is only the first part of a planned series on needs assessment procedures. It provides a general picture of some of the structural and procedural issues which states must face in early childhood development planning. It does not provide a specific model or alternative models for the statistical analysis on which planning must be based. The states, notably Texas and Idaho, which are well into their needs assessment efforts will not complete their data collection models before the fall of 1973. At that time, it is hoped that those models can be summarized, the implications of their use for other states outlined and that the resultant report can be made available as a companion to this one.

Because so many states are on the verge of embarking upon needs assessment activities of some sort, it was decided to publish this first, incomplete report immediately. The handbook was prepared by Mrs. Sally V. Allen, director of the ECS early childhood project, with the assistance of several individuals experienced in state planning who gave generously of their time and insight: Richard Ray, director of the Learning Institute of North Carolina; William Katzenmeyer, Duke University; Howard Schrag, director of Idaho's Office of Child Development; Lewis Lavine, Office of the Governor, Tennessee; and David Nesenholtz, Office of Early Childhood Development, Texas.

II. THE PLANNING STRUCTURE

Why Conduct a Needs Assessment?

If a state has limited objectives in the early childhood field, adequate funds to meet its priorities and some evidence that those objectives, funding levels and priorities will not change, it could conceivably do without a statewide needs assessment. Increasingly, however, states are finding themselves subject to growing demand for child care and to new (or proposed) federal funding and related planning requirements for child care programs. In addition they face an increasing demand for early intervention and preventive programs for handicapped children, a growing need to achieve multiagency coordination of federal, state and local resources and to create new manpower resources with the variety of competencies needed for child development programs. Of course, in the face of perennial budgetary problems, states need to allocate limited resources to provide programs--initially at least--in areas of greatest need. For then they may have maximum impact and cost benefits. At least 36 states and Puerto Rico indicate that they have initiated some type of assessment procedures. (See Appendix.)

It is an assumption of this report that, to be of greatest use, a needs assessment should be comprehensive in scope. The emphasis of the report is on assessing the needs of the five-year-old and under age group, those youngsters not yet in first grade. It could, of course, be utilized to gather information

about older children. (Many states already have available data about school-age youngsters.) It is not limited to specific population groups such as the disadvantaged. The range of information on which a comprehensive assessment should be based includes numbers and migration patterns of children and their families; socioeconomic indicators (income levels, employment patterns, racial composition of communities, etc.); provisions for child care; availability of related services; availability of manpower development resources; organization for development, administration and evaluation of child development programs; legal constraints and financial resources. Projection techniques to estimate future need should be included.

In considering the advisability of a needs assessment, it is suggested that a state examine the following assumptions:

1. Because children constitute a resource upon which the state will ultimately depend, it is in the state's best interest to help insure an optional supportive environment during the early critical years of their development.

2. In at least a significant number of cases, the family cannot be expected to meet all of the needs of the five-and-under child.

3. If a significant need for child care services exists outside the home or to reinforce the family inside the home, the state has a responsibility to provide or to see that such services are provided for children.

4. An assessment of the need for child care services is prerequisite to understanding both the magnitude and the nature of the need and is a necessary first step toward establishing such programs.

If there is substantial need for child development services,

it is improbable that an adequate funding level would be realized within the first few years of such a program. It is, of course, possible that a state might elect to proceed on the assumption that all children will be served or that the setting of priorities should be deferred until such time as the establishment of a program is achieved and the financial parameters defined.

Even if priority setting is deferred, the data that will probably be required for establishing differential need and priorities should be gathered at the time basic overall determinations of need are made. The addition of data such as socioeconomic status, population density, average family income, delinquency rates, etc., can be more economically gathered with the primary data and may, if past experience with funding should be repeated, be needed suddenly, when money is appropriated, with a relatively short time span before implementation is required.

The possible impact of federal legislation should be seriously examined as a state considers whether or not to undertake a needs assessment with a view toward comprehensive early childhood planning. There is every indication that some form of widespread federal child care program will be initiated in the next several years and that statewide planning will be required under the law. In fact, because of limited resources and increasing demand, it is probable that states with already established planning mechanisms and solid planning techniques will be given funding preference either in competition among states or for a prime sponsorship role in competition between the state itself and units of local government which desire to be funded directly from Washington, D.C. The wisdom of initiating

planning procedures now seems self-evident.

The Planning Responsibility

An essential first step to a successful needs assessment is the designation of the group or agency to be responsible to initiate, carry out and utilize (or oversee utilization of) the data-gathering process. To a large extent, those data-gathering efforts which have already been undertaken by the states have not had maximum impact because they have been conducted in a piecemeal fashion by a variety of agencies without a clear planning mandate.

The choice of who should shepherd the planning and data-gathering phases will vary from state to state. Some states already have a logical structure in which responsibility should be placed. The newly created Office of Child Development in Idaho, for example, and the Office of Early Childhood Development in Texas are now initiating data-gathering efforts. Other states which have moved in the direction of setting up coordinating mechanisms (Massachusetts, Florida, Georgia, Utah, Vermont) might utilize them for this same purpose.

In most of these states, the legislation authorizing the child development office stipulates that the duties of that office shall include the formulation of a long-range, comprehensive plan for early childhood (and family) development. The suggested legislative alternatives for establishing a state office of child development, published by the Education Commission of the States Early Childhood Project (December 1972) for state use include among the powers and duties of such an office, "to design, develop and review annually, a comprehensive statewide, community-based program to meet early childhood development and family service needs;" and "to establish a comprehen-

sive early childhood development information management system."

Similar duties could be assigned to such an office, of course, if it is established by executive order. The major objectives of the Idaho Office of Child Development, established by executive order in November 1971, are: (1) to assess the needs of children 0-6, (2) assess the services being provided, (3) find existing gaps and duplications in programs, (4) make an extensive fiscal evaluation of state and federal programs and (5) establish state priorities.

Several states have interagency child development coordinating councils which have been allocated a needs assessment and planning function. This structure is found particularly among states in the Appalachian Region, because the Appalachian Regional Commission requires that, to receive funds, states set up such a mechanism.

In some cases, the state planning agency might be an appropriate office to undertake the effort. Most states now have planning offices. These are usually housed in the executive branch, responsible to the governor, though they may be independent and equal in stature to other state administrative departments. Often they are established by legislation with a clear mandate to conduct all statewide planning programs. Sometimes they are set up by executive order as a staff arm of the governor. Then their emphasis tends to be upon areas of greatest interest to the governor, and their focus and prominence are dependent upon the priorities of the current administration. In short, the effectiveness and influence of state planning agencies vary widely from state to state. Sometimes they are well staffed, influential, respected by other state agencies and the legislature. Sometimes they are not. The

present status of the planning agency should be taken into consideration before assignment of an early childhood needs assessment is made.

In some states, it might be appropriate to assign the data-gathering responsibility to an existing state agency already concerned about the very young child and perhaps already having bits and pieces of information about the state's needs. This approach has been widely used in planning for handicapped children's education in the states with evident impact. All states have conducted some form of planning for special education needs and about 20 per cent include specific planning provisions within their special education legislation. Usually such legislation assigns primary responsibility to the state board of education for planning and for forcing districts to comply with plans. Local school boards are required to submit plans to the state education agency.

Appointment by the governor of a funded study commission or the hiring of a private firm to assess state needs and to develop a plan might be desirable alternatives. These approaches would be particularly attractive to a state which did not have an established, competent planning office or agency with responsibility for early childhood development or which did not have planning competence within any other existing agency administering programs for young children. A funded study commission has the advantage of involving in the planning process a number of influential individuals within a state who might then be interested in implementing programs which a needs assessment show to be necessary. At the same time, however, it is difficult for such individuals, who have other extensive demands upon their time, to devote the attention and to provide

the staff guidance necessary to develop a competent plan.

There are an increasing number of organizations and companies which are able to provide competent planning assistance at reasonable cost. Several specialize in the early childhood field. In the past it has been possible to fund needs assessment and planning efforts with the assistance of a private firm through Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, so that a state only pays for one-fourth of the cost. The Reynolds and Babcock Foundations have funded the Learning Institute of North Carolina to conduct an assessment of early childhood needs in that state.

If a competent firm is hired with a clear assignment and time schedule, often adequate data can be gathered in a relatively short period. Such a course, however, does not enhance the state's permanent competence for continuing assessment and planning. The source of funds will undoubtedly influence the purpose and perhaps the credibility of the information produced. If IV-A funds are utilized to employ a private firm, for example, the hiring agency would probably be the state department of social services or its equivalent. It is likely that--as a result--emphasis would be placed upon assessing the needs of the disadvantaged for day care services. Unless the hiring is done by the governor's office or through legislation with a required program for all state agencies to utilize the results, even a very comprehensive consultant-developed plan might not have broad impact.

Next Steps

Whatever office, agency or group is asked to assume responsibility for conducting the assessment, several steps should be taken by the governor or legislature.

1. Adequate funding should be provided so that staff will be available and so that other agencies will not feel that their resources are being siphoned off for this purpose. Funding levels do not need to be extravagant if the assessment makes careful use of existing and already available information and if the many volunteer and other groups in the state are encouraged to participate (such as the League of Women Voters, the state Association for the Education of Young Children, the state Association for Childhood Education International, etc.).

2. The charge to the agency should be specific and a time limit set for the initial needs assessment. The agency might be asked, for example, to: (a) review what has been done in early childhood development; (b) establish need for services; (c) gather data concerning the five-and-under child and existing child care services; (d) differentiate need by location; (e) establish criteria for defining greatest need; (f) present data geographically by the various criteria; (g) combine criteria and recommend locations. Six to nine months of concentrated effort should be sufficient to complete the process and continuous review and updating will then be necessary.

3. Efforts should be made from the beginning to stimulate public awareness and interest in the needs assessment so that there will be greater likelihood of program implementation as a result. A logical first step is the appointment of advisory councils at all levels to assist in the planning and to insure that different interests are involved from the beginning. In some states, such advisory groups exist in the form of councils set up by legislation to work with the state office of child development or required by a federal or regional funding agency. The Appalachian Regional Commission, for example, requires

states to utilize local and state councils, including parent representatives, to assist in program development. The federal legislation funding Head Start and day care programs (through the Social Security Act) requires advisory councils, including parents. The suggested state legislation prepared by the Education Commission of the States to set up an office of early childhood development outlines provisions for the director of the office to establish state and district child development and family service advisory councils to make recommendations on the state's early childhood development plan.

Included in such a structure should be a clear advisory and contributing role for the many state agencies already administering programs for young children. If a mechanism is set up so that these agencies participate in the needs assessment process, they will be more likely to cooperate in disseminating the results and in supporting any implementation efforts that are subsequently recommended.

Whatever agency or group is assigned responsibility for planning should also be charged to inform the public about all phases of its activity. It might appear that staff time devoted to such a public information effort diverts attention from the details of data gathering. But the long-range benefits of enhancing public awareness of the effort and interest in the early childhood field and in creating a climate for legislative receptivity cannot be overestimated. The appointment of advisory council members, the locations and topics of their meetings, highlights of their discussions as well as human interest stories about how children develop and special need cases, could all be the subject of central press releases and press briefings. They might be released through the governor's office. At least

the initiation of the needs assessment effort might be announced by the governor. Members of the legislature who are already interested in early childhood development or who need to be convinced might be invited to state or local advisory council meetings or to special briefings on the purposes and conduct of the assessment.

Commercial television networks--required to devote time to public service announcements and programs--might be provided with brief spots for their use. They and the educational television stations might be encouraged to devote air time to related programming; sometimes funding is available from Washington for such efforts. The Office of Consumer Affairs in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for example, sponsored a half-hour program on the consumer and child care which was broadcast over Utah's educational television station in October. If the program generated enough public interest in the four-state region in which it was aired, it was to be developed into a series.

III. THE DATA-GATHERING MODEL

It is too early in the experience of states involved in early childhood needs assessment to outline alternative data collection models with suggestions about the implications of their use. It is anticipated that by the fall of 1973 at least two states (Texas and Idaho) will have developed and tested their statistical instruments and assessment procedures. At that time, it will be possible to make those instruments available to other states which may want to adopt them or variations of them for their own use.

In the interim, however, there are many states already involved in or about to embark upon early childhood planning efforts. There are some basic considerations which these states will want to include as they move ahead in this relatively uncharted area. What constitutes "need" for example? Need is usually documented by two types of information which must be measured against each other. The first type is the standard, ideal or minimum program, service, health statistic or whatever is appropriate. The second type is a measurement of the status quo. Then, obviously, the momentary "need" is the difference between the two. The problem comes in determining whether the identified need will remain constant or may, in fact, resolve itself. Only repeated measures of the status quo--or second type of information--provide a base line of vital information about a trend. But without such trend information, a state could plan some sort of intervention program in instances when, with time, the need could resolve itself.

A primary concern of the planning unit or group assigned responsibility for gathering data and assessing needs, of course, will be cost. What is the best assessment that can be made within the budget--or perhaps even for the least amount of money? What will initial and permanent staffing needs be? The following section outlines the kinds of data needed, with some indication of the implications of different types of data.

Obviously, each state will have to make hard decisions about what is in fact priority data and what is worth collecting. The process will be a series of lively compromises between the kinds of information ideally desirable and the kinds of information already available or which may be gathered at feasible cost.

It is recommended that as a first step in the needs assessment effort, each state initiate two activities to increase the effectiveness of its data-gathering activities. First, there should be a carefully conceived and executed effort to coordinate the myriad of state-sponsored data collection activities. In almost every state there are many agencies sending surveys or interviewing the same sources for similar if not identical information. Some staff members spend a good percentage of their time simply responding to questionnaires. If data collection were the general responsibility of the governor's office, or the state census office, for example, it might be possible to coordinate these innumerable inquiries. In Tennessee, the state planning office is hoping to effect this sort of coordination within a year. Planners within each agency or department will be expected to work with the central planning office, and the costs of sampling, field personnel, projections, etc., will be shared. In some states there is an interagency

committee on the uses of data which could assume a similar function.

A second activity which states should undertake at the beginning is to consider and plan for the use of a generalized data management system as a time- and labor-saving device. It would be a worthwhile initial investment to investigate the state's computer resources (the state government, major industries and universities are logical possibilities) and to seek some advice on the selection of a data management system (there are pretested appropriate systems available through IBM, General Electric, RCA, Control Data and others). Although many piecemeal information collection efforts and some statewide efforts have recently been compiled manually, there is little reason to limit future efforts to laborious manual calculations. If, for any reason, a data collection must be begun manually, it should be planned so that it can be computerized when facilities become available or the information becomes too cumbersome. It is a relatively simple matter to write questionnaires, for example, so that responses can be fed into and tallied by computer. Without some foresight, however, such responses must be hand counted and individually interpreted, whether or not computer facilities are available. In the absence of tested data collection models, each state will have to make its own decisions about which pieces of information are relevant--and worth the cost of collection--and which are not. It would be fortuitous if each state could, early on, determine which variables are most appropriate to establishing urgency of need and which others are dependent and simply reflect the situation already suggested by the independent variables. If it is determined, for example, that the rate of juvenile delinquency parallels the density of low-income

families, then it would be logical to collect one but not both sets of indicators. Unfortunately, at this point in time it is not possible to determine, for the early childhood field, which variables might be independent and which are dependent. Each state will have to work through these calculations for itself.

In such a situation, it is recommended that a rational framework for categorizing social indicators--and thus deciding whether or not to tally them--should be adopted. Without such a framework, a state might expend valuable time and staff energy in surveying whatever bits and pieces of information can be collected without reference to any accepted plan or philosophy of action.

It would seem wise, for example, to determine: (1) the state's overall objectives and early childhood philosophy; (2) the state's general goals and areas of concern within the early childhood field; (3) specific quantitative objectives within each of the identified areas of concern (e.g. education, nutrition, health); and (4) available social indicators which might affect each of the identified components.

A state's general philosophy might be that each child should be provided the best possible environment in order to develop to his utmost capacity. Montana has recently adopted a Bill of Rights for Children which is instructive.

The general goals might be to enhance each child's physical, emotional, social and intellectual competencies and to facilitate the economic, medical and physical facilities which have a measureable affect on development. Thus specific areas of concern might include: education and development, health, nutrition, economic factors, social factors, existing child care services, and the current system (agencies) delivering services.

If it were then determined, for instance, that a program objective within the general category of "education" would be to raise the language development of all five-year-old children to prepare them for entry into first grade, it would follow that the data gatherers should look at the number of children younger than six who have language problems. Similarly, if it were determined that a program objective should be to provide integrated educational programs to as many handicapped children as possible in public kindergartens, then the data-gatherers would have to determine how many handicapped children who might benefit from such an approach exist in the state and how many are currently served in integrated classroom programs.

In the health category, it might be decided to reduce infant mortality by 20 per cent, or to immunize 90 per cent of the under-six population against mumps. Then it would be important to know the present infant mortality rate, areas of concentration, numbers of expectant mothers receiving prenatal care, in-hospital and out-of-hospital births, etc., and how many youngsters are immunized against mumps, where they are, etc. It will be important to be aware of the innumerable hazards in each specific set of figures. Often, for example, immunizations given by private physicians are not recorded in public health figures, so some areas with low immunization rates are in fact those with a high concentration of private pediatricians.

In the economic factors category, it might be agreed to aim to provide quality day care facilities to the preschool children of all working mothers who are heads of poverty households. In the social factors category, it might be advisable to reduce the rate of child abuse by 20 per cent. In housing, it might be determined to eliminate lead paint poisonings in children under six

within five years. The information required from which plans could be developed follow from the objectives.

In child care services, a possible objective would be to offer day care programs to all four- and five-year-olds who can use them, or to provide diagnostic services to all three-year-olds who might have an educationally related handicap. With regard to current delivery of services, the objective could be to identify those agencies currently offering or administering programs for parent training in any aspect of child development.

The use of such a framework should assist the states in winnowing out the information which is essential at this point in time. Such an approach, of course, will have to take into consideration the characteristics of child care over which states can (or should) have some influence and the relationship between services and their affect on the attainment of any stated objectives. For example, the child staff ratio in a day care center might be identified as a necessary condition to meet a minimum objective and can be specified in state legislation. The involvement of parents is critical but depends ultimately upon parental interest and staff-parent communication and probably cannot be legislated.

Once such a conceptual framework has been adopted, a state would devote its resources profitably to determining: (a) identifiable information sources and (b) existing state and federally funded services. A simple questionnaire has been devised by the Education Commission of the States, working with the Colorado Legislative Council, for a very preliminary needs assessment in that state. One staff member working for four weeks was able to administer and compile results which give a good overview of existing and projected needs and existing services to meet those

needs.

The Idaho Office of Child Development is now completing:

(a) an agency service survey to identify services being provided by public and private agencies to children 0-6, (2) a clientele survey to evaluate, on the basis of a random sample, services needed by and being served to children 1-6 years and (3) a survey of prenatal, perinatal and postnatal services which is being conducted in conjunction with the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education and the University of Washington School of Medicine.

The state agencies most commonly administering programs for young children which should be approached initially are the departments of education, social services, health, institutions (mental health, mental retardation) and labor and employment. Federal agencies, which should be approached through the regional office of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, are the Office of Education, Office of Child Development, Social and Rehabilitative Services and the regional Office of Economic Opportunity. Other logical and accessible sources of data are the Bureau of the Census and Employment Security Commission offices. It is important, in analyzing information provided by administering agencies, to distinguish between actual numbers of children served and capacities for serving children. The Texas survey, for example, discovered that welfare figures for foster care were based on capacity rather than actual children receiving care and that, because no age breakdowns were available, figures were total capacity for all foster care. The result was a listing of five to ten times as much foster care for 0-6 year olds as really existed.

Census information is available on magnetic tape, can be

assessed by the computer and located geographically in areas as small as census tracts or enumeration districts. At least one state was able to utilize tax information. Texas utilized the population research center at the University of Texas, the Vital Statistics Office of the State Department of Health, the Municipal League, the Migrant Council and Zero Population Growth, in addition to the usual sources.

Information specific to the existing child care facilities may need to be gathered at its source. Where state or local licensing is required for such facilities, data can be gathered from the licensing agency, or at least the numbers and locations of such agencies can be determined. Where such licensing is not required, identifying existing child care facilities will be a greater problem. The schools and social service agencies are among the best sources. A simple questionnaire given to elementary school children concerning their five-and-under siblings will reveal the vast majority of child care facilities. If data are collected for state and county totals, regional totals can subsequently be tallied. It may be difficult to get agency information on a county breakdown. Unless school districts coincide with county boundaries, it will be difficult to utilize school district information. Head Start information will generally overlap district or county boundaries.

If funds are short, volunteers from agencies interested in children, such as PTA and League of Women Voters, may be used to ferret out the more difficult to find information. It is possible that local personnel, because of their familiarity with the community, can often do a more effective job of data-gathering at lower cost than nonresident personnel. Using local personnel effectively requires careful and complete specification

of the data to be gathered and simple, well-defined recording procedures.

Census Tract Information

Much basic information can be readily obtained through the 1970 census tapes. For greatest future flexibility of use, information should be sought for the smallest possible geographic or governmental entity; most is available by census tract. It should be noted that census data on welfare statistics may be inaccurate; county welfare departments are an alternate source for these figures. The census provides information primarily on: (a) children and their families and (b) socioeconomic indicators.

The major categories of information available which might be useful for early childhood planning are listed below with brief comments on their implications.

(a) Children and Their Families

Number of children five and under	Provides a general picture of the maximum number potentially eligible for preprimary programs.
Density of population	Indicates areas of concentrated need; more heavily populated areas will have more young children, probably more working mothers, perhaps more disadvantaged children. Also indicates problems in delivering services in sparsely populated areas.
Number, single parent homes	Suggests the need for day care.
Out-migration, in-migration, 1960 & 1970; commuting status	Indicates population trends which might affect future planning by pinpointing geographic areas where needs can be expected to expand or decrease. Commuting patterns will indicate number of hours before and after work that

Percent and location of families with children five and under with mother tongue other than English

Education, fertility and family composition by metropolitan and non-metropolitan residence

(b) Socioeconomic Indicators

Average annual family income

Density of low, middle, high-income families

Number and location of AFDC families

Occupation of employed persons

Percentage and location of unemployed workers

Location and density of sub-standard housing

Composition of community by racial and ethnic groups

day care will be needed; and may suggest a shift in the need for services by location if mothers elect to use services near where they work rather than where they live.

Indicates need for bilingual programs and staff and for cultural sensitivity in planning.

Indicates trends useful for planning for manpower resources for staffing services and suggests training needs for staff and parents.

Separates number of families able to obtain private child development services from those who will have to rely partially or totally on public services.

Locates areas with greatest economic need for public services and with least need.

Identifies areas with need for welfare services and where there is eligibility for federally-funded programs.

Identifies numbers and location of borderline eligibility cases, i.e. "bluecollar" and other families unable to afford private programs but ineligible for most public ones.

Suggests availability of personnel for child development programs and the need for programs to alleviate unemployment.

Indicates areas with greatest physical hazards; reaffirms socioeconomic needs evident in other statistics.

Identifies areas with minority populations which might be low income areas, would have special cultural considerations.

Number and location of employed mothers with young children.

Identifies areas where day care needs may be greatest.

Number and location of juvenile crime offenses*

Suggests areas of family breakdown, need for parent education and other family services.

(c) Health and Nutrition (Bureau of Vital Statistics)

Degree of infant and maternal mortality

Indicates need for pre-, peri-, and post-natal services.

Number, illegitimate births

Suggests need for family planning clinics, parent education.

Incidence of birth defects

Suggests need for pre- and post-natal services, genetic counseling; valuable for determining special education needs for preprimary age youngsters and need for diagnostic screening services.

Incidence of handicaps in children between one and six years old

Indicates need for remedial and special education services for preprimary youngsters and for diagnostic screening services.

The census data, of course, do not answer several key questions about predictions of future need. It would be most useful to know, for example, how many mothers of very young children might be working and requiring day care in five years? Or whether there are migration patterns within the state or into and out of the state suggesting that the number of large families, disadvantaged families, single-parent families, etc., will increase, decrease or relocate within the state. A state gathering-planning instrument should take these problems into consideration.

*Information available from FBI Uniform Crime Statistics, State Police Annual Statistics, State Law Enforcement Planning Agency.

Other Data Required

In addition to the information readily available through the census, sound planning should be based upon knowledge about current child care and related services, manpower resources, administrative mechanisms, legal constraints, financial provisions and other resources, as outlined below. Some method should be devised for projecting future need; ultimately, decisions should be made about which data are essential (independent) variables and which are the dependent or overlapping (and thus not essential) variables. If it is determined, for example, that the number and location of neonatal deaths coincides closely and consistently with the density of low-income families, it would be logical to collect data either about neonatal deaths or low-income families, but not both. Initially it would be advisable to collect as much information as possible to eliminate the need to recollect material that might later be determined to be significant.

Provisions for Child Care/Development

Number of child care centers,
5 or more

These indicators provide the component parts of the current picture of programs available for children.

Enrollment potential of child
care centers

Nature of programs: custodial;
developmental; full day; part
day; evening care; emphasis on
parent involvement

Sponsorship of programs, 5 or
more children: for profit;
church, community agency or
organization; federally sponsored
program; United Fund, etc.

Number of children actually enrolled,
centers for 5 or more

Number of children in care,
groups of 4 or less

Total number of children receiving care: full time; part time

Number of centers licensed/registered by local or state agency

Cost of child care/development

Availability of Related Services

Health resources to child care/development centers

Availability and nature of family and community services

Special assistance for handicapped children

Assistance in management, financing, organization

These indicators will give a comprehensive picture of existing developmental services.

Availability of Manpower Development Resources

Number and quality of "in-service" and "pre-service" staff development programs

Sponsorship and funding source of manpower development programs: university; local or state agency; private organization

Nature of available training resources; degree program; 2-year or 4-year; inservice; consultation

Number of participants in training, last 3 years

Cost of training to participants

These indicators will give a quantitative picture of current personnel training programs.

Organization for Development, Administration and Evaluation of Child Development Programs

At the municipal and county level

At the state level

Evidence or lack of evidence of coordinated programming

Agency responsibility for child development; how responsibility conferred

These data are important for assessing the current administrative structure, possible need for program coordination.

Existing Statewide Financial Provisions
for Child Development Programs

State financial support: purposes and amount of appropriations last three years	This information will suggest present levels and proportions of federal/state local support and could indicate potential future financial resources
Federal financial support: purposes and amount of appropriations used and available, last three years	
Local financial support: purposes and amount of appropriation used and available, last three years	

Nongovernmental resources

Description of Statewide Resources for Program Development,
Research and Evaluation

University programs	This information could provide a basis for future co-operation between research programs and program operators
Regional education labs and R & D centers	
Nonpublic resources	

Minimal data about existing services and responsibilities might be obtained through the survey technique conducted in the fall of 1972 in Colorado and mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Comprehensive information about state legal codes relating to children can be readily obtained through a unique, private organization, the Aspen Systems Corp. in Pittsburgh, Pa., which has available on computer tapes information about existing legislation in all states. A complete print-out of legislation relating to young children in any given state is available in short titles or in the full text through a retrieval system based upon all relevant key words (e.g.: child, young child, juvenile, handicapped child, parent training, child services). To acquire this print-out, an agency or organization must pay a membership fee or a onetime retrieval fee.

Some states have this information available on their own

computer-based retrieval system. Generally, responsibility rests with the legislative council and inquiries about its existence, availability and competence should be made to that group.

A state might decide to assign a staff person, perhaps a graduate student or intern, to begin such a legislative analysis if the information is not readily available or if it does not want to utilize the Aspen Systems Corp. for any reason. A number of private organizations are available to summarize their own ongoing research with specific regard to the early childhood field. A list of these organizations has been compiled by the Office of Child Development in the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and is available through the Research and Evaluation Division. At least one state, Idaho, has been assisted by the Regional Attorney General's Office, through arrangements made by the Regional Office of Child Development. Idaho first obtained information on state legislation through key-word retrieval from the Aspen Systems Corp. and then asked the Regional Office of the Attorney General to analyze how the state laws interfaced with federal regulations for children.

If a state does not have easily accessible information about available financial resources for early childhood programs, and does not have the local staff to conduct such a survey, it might employ specialized researchers to compile the material. Idaho, for example, has asked a private firm in Seattle to review the state's present and potential financial resources. The results of that review, when completed, might be useful to other states.

Local Attitudes and Demands

To be most realistic, a needs assessment must include some indication of what people really want and will want in child

development services. To know that there are 100,000 four-year-old children of working mothers is of little importance if all those mothers would rather leave their youngsters with grandmothers even if a vast array of public alternatives are provided. At least two states are incorporating such an attitudinal survey in their needs assessment. Massachusetts, in a state study conducted by a private firm, asked what kinds of programs families wanted and what they would be willing to spend for them.

Idaho has used two methods to assess the array of public opinion. The first is through a speak-out forum developed through the State Office of Child Development under the auspices of a 4-C grant received from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The speak-outs are public and open to all those who are interested in child development, including those who administer and those who use programs. Proceedings of the speak-outs are taped and later transcribed with particular attention to the priorities developed by each speak-out group. The second procedure for assessing public opinion was developed as part of the two per cent consumer survey. Consumer opinion concerning the types of child care parents would like to have for children with and without special needs is being gathered.

Use of the Computer

Information concerning variables can be presented on a map, the data for which are analyzed and presented by existing computer programs.

A composite map may be produced in which all of the variables identified as criteria are combined in a specified manner. This map will identify the areas of greatest need as defined by the criteria selected. Superimposing on this map the location of existing child care facilities may also be desirable.

There are a variety of computer programs which will produce such maps on the line printer, the Calcomp plotter or provide the information to make such maps manually. The Triable Universities Computation Center, Durham, N. C., has produced maps using the "Grid" and "Symap" programs. The Trend Surface Analysis Program at the University of Wisconsin provides a method of estimating the distribution of need from a relatively small number of cases, while "Symap" and "Grid" plot only the information provided to them.

Once the data required are ready to be processed by machine, the production of maps is relatively inexpensive. The production of maps, such as shown, might vary from \$300 to \$1,500, depending on the amount of data to be processed and familiarity with the programs.

Head Count vs. Sampling Techniques

The two basic counting methods which can be employed in such data-gathering efforts are surveying individuals or sampling segments of the population in order to draw general conclusions. It is generally agreed that some sampling techniques are reliable and much less expensive to conduct than an individual head count method. Sampling might be combined with projection techniques, for example, to screen for pockets of need outside critical counties. In many states, it should be possible to combine sampling techniques with some individual counting because the individual approach is required for a periodic screening of Aid to Families for Dependent Children (AFDC) under Title 19 of the Social Security Act. Although the purpose of this tracking is different, the information could be utilized.

In at least one state, the feasibility of a statewide individual tracking system is now being explored. Tennessee has

hired a computer expert to examine the possibility of building a child development computer data system. He is examining, as one possibility, a statistical survey model on an individual child basis. Information would be gathered on each child at birth and updated continuously. Such a system would thus in six years provide complete information about all children in the state younger than first graders because each individual record would be comprehensive. It should eliminate the duplication and double counting which plague planners. Once the Tennessee feasibility study is completed, and of course particularly if the state decides to undertake such an effort, it will be possible to get an estimate of the actual benefits of full-scale individual tracking and an indication of whether, in fact, such an individual count produces results substantially different from sampling techniques.

The mapping method, while useful to the professional, also provides a medium for presentation which communicates effectively and nontechnically to legislators and lay people.

Costs

Data-gathering costs will vary significantly, depending on the variables selected as criteria and the ease of access to the data. For Idaho to complete a review of existing data and gather additional data relevant to child development planning, the total procedure took one year and cost \$72,000. Texas has budgeted approximately \$200,000 for a one-year effort to develop a plan for a statewide comprehensive early childhood program, including a needs assessment and information system.

IV. THE PUBLIC RELATIONS EFFORT

The entire data-gathering process will be of little use unless public awareness of the effort--and public involvement in interpreting the results--are given high priority. Without such public interest, there is little likelihood that programs to meet established need can be adequately developed. The legislature will need to be convinced that the public wants what the planners say it needs.

There are several specific steps which a state might consider as it works out its planning and public relations goals. Initially, however, the process of data interpretation should be carefully examined. At issue is whether the data-gatherers and state planners should "tell" the public what the collected information means to program development, or whether the information should be reported without official interpretation for public reaction and analysis. To some extent, of course, the data gatherers and planners will have made interpretations and drawn conclusions about the meaning of information collected. But it seems important to the overall impact of such an effort that emphasis be placed upon public interpretation and evaluation of the data as it is collected. Public involvement and interest, as conclusions are reached, are likely to have more broad-reaching and long-term results.

Experience indicates, however, that some interpretation assistance should be available. Experts in planning and those who have worked in the field who will undoubtedly have their own opinions should be encouraged to suggest the implications of

certain outcomes. But final interpretations should be the result of cooperative analysis of the planners and professional data-gatherers and the public. Both Idaho and Texas are setting up mechanisms to accomplish such an effort.

The purpose of a state public information program in the early childhood field--in conjunction with a needs assessment effort--should be: (1) to focus public attention on the importance of the formative years in a child's development; (2) to provide information about existing programs and services for young children (3) to encourage public interpretation of data collected in the needs assessment and planning process and (4) to solicit public support for ongoing and proposed early childhood services.

Responsibility for development and implementation of a state public information program should be assigned by the governor to one agency or group which has broad involvement in the early childhood field. If a statewide coordinating council or office of child development has been established, or if coordinating and planning duties have been assigned to an existing state agency, that would be the logical choice.

The designated group or agency should consider a variety of public information activities. A first step would be to analyze present public awareness of the pros and cons of early childhood programs and their current availability in the state. Among the groups to be looked at would be state legislators, postsecondary institutions training professional and paraprofessional personnel, early childhood program administrators in all fields (health, mental health, day care, education, etc.); parent groups, the general public, the press. If it is determined that the awareness is low in some or all of these groups, it would be

logical to develop a plan to provide information to the appropriate audiences through the appropriate media. It might be useful, for example, to prepare a concise presentation of the benefits of early childhood programs, the misrepresentations which sometimes result when early childhood programs are interpreted primarily as early schooling in classroom situations, a summary of the kinds of activities which other states are undertaking and the cost factors, including cost benefits, which might be involved.

Special interest reports might be initiated in the printed, radio and television media by bringing existing happenings to public attention (e.g.: a day care program for migrants operating in a bus; the handicapped child who is given early remedial treatment because specially trained staff could make an early diagnosis). The use of radio and television public service spots should be explored. The Federal Communications Commission now requires the commercial stations to provide some air time at no cost for public service purposes.

In addition, newsworthy happenings could be planned with a view toward press coverage. Nationally known political and educational experts could be invited to consult with the governor and staff with appropriate press conferences. A statewide governors' or congressmen's or state agency or legislative conference on early childhood development could be planned with appropriate publicity. Several states have held such meetings with significant success. U.S. Congressman Orval Hansen sponsored such a meeting in Idaho in the summer of 1972 for more than 300 state leaders. South Dakota superintendent Don Barnhart sponsored a conference in September 1972. Delaware has held a day care conference sponsored by the state department of social

services for several years. The Colorado Commission on Children and Youth sponsored the first Governor's Conference on the Young Child in December 1972.

Specific informational materials might be developed about existing services in conjunction with those groups already interested in such an effort [like Community Coordinated Child Care Committees (4-C) and regional HEW offices]. Pamphlets for special ethnic groups in their languages with careful local distribution would be of particular benefit in some areas. A Spanish language handout for migrants, for example, could outline local services available and how to get them.

Among the steps the Texas Office of Early Childhood Development plans to take are the preparation of 25 newspaper articles on early childhood development for use by daily or weekly papers throughout the state, the initiation of a weekly question and answer column for similar distribution and an annual report for the office itself. The first story the office prepared was sent to some 600 papers throughout Texas and was run by almost 450 of them.

An organized effort should be made to identify and involve established organizations in the dissemination of information and in working with the state legislature. In most states there are a number of groups interested or potentially interested in the early childhood field. These include the League of Women Voters, the League of Jewish Women, NOW, the Commission on the Status of Women, the Commission on Children and Youth, advisory councils set up under federal legislation such as for Title I of the Elementary/Secondary Education Act and Title IV-A of the Social Security Act, the board and policy groups of Head Start, hospital and dental auxiliaries, associations of private program operations, the Junior League, and state affiliations of national

organizations such as the State Association of the Education of Young Children and the State Association for Childhood Education International.

An adequate budget should be developed and funds made available for such an effort. It is estimated that a minimum budget for this portion of the state assessment and planning effort should cover one-half-time staff person (\$120,000 per year) for \$10,000; one-half-time secretary (\$16,000 per year) for \$3,000; and printing, mailing, phone, etc. of \$5,000 for a first-year total of \$18,000. The Texas Office of Early Childhood Development has estimated that approximately \$90,000 and a staff of six would be required for its information dissemination objective.

SURVEY OF STATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

Fall 1972

<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Activities Undertaken or Planned to Gather Data and Assess Early Childhood Needs</u>
ALABAMA	Louise S. Higgins Early Childhood Consultant State Office Bldg. Montgomery 36104	Alabama Child Development Study 1971-72; Appalachian Planning Grant, under direc- tion of Interdepartmental Coordinating Committee for Early Child Development; Alabama Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Education, State Dept. of Education.
ALASKA	Betty McCallum Early Childhood Education Section Chief Dept. of Education Poech F Juneau 99801	The newly created Office of Child Advocacy will be re- sponsible for data gather- ing. At present, many agen- cies do it. Native Regional Corporations are currently conducting needs assessments and various other agencies have done all sorts of needs assessments.
ARIZONA	Gerald H. Cline State Dept. of Education 1535 Jefferson Phoenix 85007	No answer.
ARKANSAS	Lowther Penn State Dept. of Education Little Rock 72201	Statewide survey.
CALIFORNIA	No reply	
COLORADO	Virginia Plunkett State Dept. of Education Denver 80203	Training needs and resources are being surveyed through an EPDA grant to the Colo- rado Dept. of Education.
CONNECTICUT	Harriet C. Nashland Early Childhood Education State Dept. of Education State Office Building Hartford 06115	Governor's Interdepartmental Day Care Task Force is devel- oping survey and analysis ma- terial. Early childhood staff of state dept. of edu- cation, with cooperation of professional associations, is developing telephone "hot line" service and information centers.

<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Activities Undertaken or Planned to Gather Data and Assess Early Childhood Needs</u>
DELAWARE	Judith Meres State Dept. of Public Instruction Dover 19901	4-C Committee has gathered data on number of children served. Early childhood staff training project has gathered data on education level of employees.
FLORIDA	Minnie Lee Rowland Department of Education 359 Knott Bldg. Tallahassee 32304	At present, a program is being organized to set up guidelines and general su- pervision for all projects which are financed by public funds.
GEORGIA	Allan W. Gurley State Dept. of Education Atlanta 30334	Department of Education, Office of Staff Services, Division of Planning and Evaluation Services.
GUAM	No reply	
HAWAII	Genevieve T. Okinaga Program Specialist Early Childhood Education P. O. Box 2360 Honolulu 96804	Under the Commission on Chil- dren and Youth, the State 4-C Policy Committee and County 4-C Committees are doing some studies. The Legislative Reference Bureau is also con- ducting a short-term study. The DOE has recently completed a Study in Early Childhood Ed- ucation in Hawaii and has launched a project to develop a plan for comprehensive early childhood program for the state.
IDAHO	Howard Schrag, Director Office of Child Development 314 State, Statehouse Boise 83707 and Roy Truby Administrative Assistant Office of the Governor Boise 83707	The Idaho Office of Child De- velopment is studying the needs of children within the state. Report will be avail- able about December 1972.

<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Activities Undertaken or Planned to Gather Data and Assess Early Childhood Needs</u>
ILLINOIS	Marilynn Stark Curriculum Development Section 316 Second Springfield 62706	State Department of Education surveyed a random sample of 100 kindergartens relative to types of program, education of teacher, needs identified by local school administrators.
INDIANA	Barbara J. Anderson Indiana 4-C Committee 319 State Office Bldg. 100 Senate Indianapolis 46204	None
IOWA	Jane Hagen, Consultant Child Development State Dept. of Public Instruction Grimes Bldg. Des Moines 50319	No reply
KANSAS	T. William Goodwin State Dept. of Education 120 Tenth Topeka 66612	State Standards is currently conducting a study concerning early childhood certification requirements.
KENTUCKY	Patrick West Jr. Consultant Early Childhood Education State Dept. of Education Frankfort 40601	Kindergarten Task Force Committee, Kentucky Infant Preschool Program and an interagency committee on early childhood development.
LOUISIANA	Diane Sorola Bureau of Early Childhood Education P. O. Box 44064 State Dept. of Education Baton Rouge 70804	Research is presently being conducted by the Bureau of Early Childhood Education into the status of early childhood education in the U.S. and programs in use throughout the nation. Starting this fall, the Bureau will visit sample parishes to test and assess needs.
MAINE	Kermit S. Nickerson Dept. of Educational & Cultural Services Education Building Augusta 04330	Legislation is proposed to require kindergarten program for all children.
MARYLAND	Fred H. Spigler Jr. State House Annapolis 21404	The interagency council is assessing the need.

<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Activities Undertaken or Planned to Gather Data and Assess Early Childhood Needs</u>
MASSACHUSETTS	Gwen Morgan Office for Children Room 908 100 Cambridge Boston 02202 Barbara L. King Supervisor of Kindergartens 182 Tremont Boston 02158	Office for Children has new mandate to produce a plan each year. In coordinated planning (4-C) surveys departments each year, gathers and publishes data on needs and resources, but funding picture is so complex that complete profile is never achieved.
MICHIGAN	Charles P. Silas, Consultant Preschool & Follow Through Dept. of Education P. O. Box 420 Lansing 48840	A First Grade Assessment Battery (Criterion or Objectives Referenced, to be administered at entry-first grade level) is underway as part of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (currently involves fourth and seventh graders only); target date: Sept. 1974.
MINNESOTA	Corinna Moncada State Dept. of Education Capitol Square 550 Cedar St. Paul 55101	Minnesota State Planning Agency has formed a committee to study coordination of agencies in early childhood.
MISSISSIPPI	Dr. Troy D. White Supervisor of Elementary Education State Dept. of Education P. O. Box 771 Jackson 39205	No answer.
MISSOURI	Grace McReynolds Box 480 Jefferson City 65101	State Department of Education has a study group working.
MONTANA	Lyle A. Eggum, Supervisor Elementary Education Ofc. of the Supt. of Public Instruction Capitol Bldg. Helena 59601	A coalition of organizations have begun gathering data which will culminate in kindergarten legislation at the 43rd Legislative Assembly.
NEBRASKA	No reply	
NEVADA	Georgia A. Hastings State Dept. of Education Heroes Memorial Bldg. Carson City 89701	No answer.

<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Activities Undertaken or Planned to Gather Data and Assess Early Childhood Needs</u>
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Cynthia E. Mowles Consultant Early Childhood Education Dept. of Education 410 State House Annex Concord 03301	An early child education task force is in the process of gathering information concerning the needs of young children in New Hampshire.
NEW JERSEY	Joseph McSweeney, Act. Dir. Early Childhood Education 100 Spruce Trenton 08638	Study underway in State Dept. of Education.
NEW MEXICO	Blanche Collie State Dept. of Education Education Building Santa Fe 87501	An evaluation was conducted by the State Dept. of Education of the kindergarten programs under the administration of the public school system. This will become part of the statewide evaluation effort.
NEW YORK	Ruth C. Flurry Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education 667 State Education Annex Washington St. Albany 12224	A State Social Development Planning Commission has done a survey of need for service in the area of day care and nursery school.
NORTH CAROLINA	J. W. Jenkins, Director Division of Kindergarten ECE State Dept. of Public Instruction Raleigh 27602	The Learning Institute of North Carolina is presently planning a county-by-county assessment on status of programs and needs of children under school age.
NORTH DAKOTA	Lowell Jensen Dept. of Public Instruction State Capitol Bismarck 58501	Reading needs assessment compiled provision for early childhood education. Early childhood data collected three years ago.
OHIO	Eugene B. Wenger State Dept. of Education 65 Front Columbus 43215	A 1969 in-depth study of Ohio's preschool needs was undertaken by the Battelle Memorial Institute. The study was funded by the Ohio Department of Education.

<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Activities Undertaken or Planned to Gather Data and Assess Early Childhood Needs</u>
OKLAHOMA	Sally Augustine State Dept. of Education 4545 Lincoln Blvd. Suite 162 Oklahoma City 73105	Survey of teachers holding early childhood certificates to determine worth of EPDA projects in teacher training in the states (1970-71); survey to teachers in state to determine instructional materials needs (1971).
OREGON	Jean Spaulding 942 Lancaster Dr., NE Salem 97301	Task force being set up to include this task.
PENNSYLVANIA	J. E. Kosoloski, Director Bureau of General and Academic Education State Dept. of Education Box 911 Harrisburg 17126	The state legislated Quality Assessment of public education programs plans to initiate data-gathering procedures.
	Charlotte G. Garman Coordinator Early Childhood Education Box 911 State Dept. of Education Harrisburg 17126	The Governor's Committee on Coordinated Child Care has appointed a committee to gather data and assess needs.
PUERTO RICO	Pilar Casillas de Perez Acting Director Early Childhood Program Dept. of Education Hato Rey 00919	1. Studies on the academic progress of children with and without kindergarten have been made. 2. Studies are made about new schools to be open and enrollments of the areas. 3. Studies are made about preparation of teachers in order to upgrade them. 4. Regional supervisors are consulted about the needs of the different regions.
RHODE ISLAND	No reply	
SOUTH CAROLINA	Janet Stanton Keith Early Childhood Education Supervisor Department of Education Columbia 29201	1. State Board of Education has adopted a 5-year plan to implement statewide kindergarten program by 1975-76. 2. Survey made by Office of the Governor to assess program needs of 3- and 4-year-olds.
	Barbara Mosses, Director Child Development Programs Div. of Administration Office of the Governor 915 Main St. Columbia 29201	

<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Activities Undertaken or Planned to Gather Data and Assess Early Childhood Needs</u>
SOUTH DAKOTA	Jean Gore Early Childhood Consultant SE Leaning Center University of South Dakota Vermillion 57069	Early Childhood Conference, out of which recommendations for a Governor's Commission for Early Childhood, creden- tialing and/or training for all early childhood teacher and paraprofessional levels and concern for parent and family.
TENNESSEE	Kathryn Warren 132-E Cordell Hull Bldg. Nashville 37219	The Department has gathered data concerning all public school administered programs under grade 1 for informa- tion and planning purposes during the past 3 years. Questionnaires are being reviewed and will no doubt be revised in order to ob- tain more extensive and ad- ditional information as well as from other sources.
TEXAS	Jeannette Watson Director Office of Early Childhood Development Texas Dept. of Community Affairs P. O. Box 13166 Capitol Station Austin 78711	Information is currently col- lected by the Texas Education Agency and Office of Infor- mation Services. A state- wide early childhood needs assessment and information system is currently being de- veloped by the Office of Early Childhood Development, in conjunction with these and other state agencies in- volved in serving young children.
UTAH	Delbert Higgins State Dept. of Education 1400 University Club Bldg. 136 East South Temple Salt Lake City 84111	The State Board of Education is presently gathering data on services rendered young children and by whom. It is anticipated that the Office of Child Development, to be established within the Office of the State Board of Educa- tion, will complete this task and publish the data.
VERMONT	Joan G. Babbott, M.D. Office of Child Development 43 State St. Montpelier 056021	There is a pressing need for the data and we have plans to secure it as soon as the re- sources (staff and funds) are available for doing so.

<u>State</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Activities Undertaken or Planned to Gather Data and Assess Early Childhood Needs</u>
VIRGINIA	S. P. Johnson Jr. State Dept. of Education Richmond 23216	The Standards of Quality and Objectives for Virginia Public Schools, enacted by the General Assembly in 1972, require that each school division not providing kindergarten by 1974 must develop a plan, including an acceptable implementation date, to provide such a program. Division superintendents are required to prepare five-year plans for public education, which must be updated annually and submitted to the state superintendent and school board for approval. Communities are to be involved.
VIRGIN ISLANDS	No reply	
WASHINGTON	Roberta LaCoste Assistant Director Elementary Education State Dept. of Public Instruction Olympia 98504	No answer.
WEST VIRGINIA	John Himelrick Director Interagency Council for Child Development Services Office of the Governor Capitol Complex Charleston 25305	The Department of Welfare is currently completing a statewide assessment of all areas of day care needs.
WISCONSIN	Sue Ann Bates Preschool-Kindergarten Consultant State Dept. of Public Instruction 126 Langdon Madison 53702	A survey questionnaire has been prepared to be distributed this year by the State Department of Education. Health and Social Services has also done some work in this area.
WYOMING	Mark M. Fox State Dept. of Education Cheyenne 82001	None.

Publications of the ECS Early Childhood Project:

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT: Alternatives for program implementation in the states (June 1971: \$1)

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS FOR MIGRANTS: Alternatives for the states (May 1972: \$1)

ESTABLISHING A STATE OFFICE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT: Suggested Legislative Alternatives (December 1972: no charge)

EARLY CHILDHOOD PLANNING IN THE STATES: A handbook for gathering data and assessing needs (January 1973: \$1)

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS IN THE STATES: Report of a December 1972 conference (February 1973: \$1)

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROJECT NEWSLETTER (published occasionally: no charge).

ecs steering committee 1972 - 1973

Chairman

*Governor Winfield Dunn, Tennessee

Vice Chairman

*Warren G. Hill, Chancellor for Higher Education, Connecticut

Chairman-Elect

*Governor Reubin O'D. Askew, Florida

Treasurer

*Senator Bennett D. Katz, Maine

Secretary

Wendell H. Pierce, Education Commission of the States

Members

Governor Stanley Hathaway, Wyoming

Governor Bruce King, New Mexico

Governor Tom McCall, Oregon

Governor James Exon, Nebraska

Governor John Gilligan, Ohio

Governor William Cahill, New Jersey

Senator Bryce Baggett, Oklahoma

Representative Darwin Allen, Kentucky

Representative Manny S. Brown, Wisconsin

Representative Charles W. Clabaugh, Illinois

Senator Robert English, New Hampshire

Representative Max H. Homer, Pennsylvania

Representative Floyd M. Sack, Colorado

Robert S. Babcock, Provost, Vermont State Colleges

Karl Grittner, Principal, Johnson High School, Minnesota

Everett Keith, Executive Secretary, Missouri Teachers Association

Darld J. Long, Executive Director, Utah School Board Association

**Ewald Nyquist, State Commissioner of Education, New York

Mrs. Eldra Shulterbrandt, Trustee, College of the Virgin Islands

*Robert F. Williams, Executive Secretary, Virginia Education Association

Joseph M. Cronin, Secretary, Executive Office of Education Affairs, Massachusetts

Richard H. Kosaki, Chancellor, New Campus, University of Hawaii

William Robinson, Associate Commissioner of Education, Rhode Island

*Cameron West, Vice President for Planning General Administration, University of North Carolina

Robert H. McBride, President, State Board of Education, Delaware

*Philip B. Swain, Director, Management Development, The Boeing Company, Washington

Mrs. Hope Kading, Legislative Coordinator, PTA, Boise, Idaho

James E. Stratton, Chief Director of Apprenticeship Standards, California

Advisory Members

**Governor Robert W. Scott, North Carolina

*Senator Mary L. Nock, Maryland

Representative B. G. Hendrix, Arkansas

Representative Mildred H. Banfield, Alaska

Representative Pete Turnham, Alabama

John Loughlin, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indiana

Cyril Busbee, State Superintendent of Education, South Carolina

**The Reverend John Bloh, New Jersey Catholic Conference

Enrique Diaz, Chairman, Council of Higher Education, Puerto Rico

Abner McCall, President, Baylor University, Texas

Mrs. Ray E. Miller, Member, North Dakota Board of Education

*Member, Executive Committee

**Advisory Member, Executive Committee

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

